

Title	Semantic Properties of -Ni NP and -O NP of Japanese Psych-verbs
Author(s)	Bando, Michiko
Citation	大阪大学言語文化学. 5 p.165-p.177
Issue Date	1996-03-31
oaire:version	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/78120
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

Semantic Properties of *-Ni* NP and *-O* NP of Japanese Psych-verbs*

Michiko BANDO**

日本語の感情を表す動詞（以下心理動詞と呼ぶ）はその内項の位置に「に」名詞句をとるものと「を」名詞句をとるものがある。さらに、例えば「喜ぶ」のように、「に」名詞句と「を」名詞句を交替でとる動詞がある。これは意味的にも統語的にも等しい自由交替の現象であろうか。

本稿ではまず、上記の格の分布に従って心理動詞を3つのグループに分類する。次に、「に」名詞句は感情を引き起こす「原因」という意味役割を、「を」名詞句は感情の「対象」という意味役割を担っているという先行研究の観察を基に、さらに残る問題をいくつか挙げる。その問題を詳しくみるため、各グループの動詞のとり「に」名詞句と、「を」名詞句の意味的特徴を検討する。そこで「に」名詞句をもつ単文の意味が曖昧であることを観察し、「に」名詞句には「原因」に加えて「対象」の役割も同時に担っていることを指摘する。一方、「を」名詞句の単文の解釈は曖昧性がなく「対象」の意味である。この意味的特徴からみて、「喜ぶ」動詞の補語にとれる「に」と「を」は自由交替の現象ではないことが言えるであろう。最後に、「に」名詞句と「に」と交替する「を」名詞句が命題から派生した可能性のあることを述べる。

1 Introduction

Japanese verbs that express our psychological state (hereafter psych-verbs) typically take two arguments: one has the semantic role (thematic role or θ -role) Experiencer marked by Nominative Case *-ga* (or Topic *-wa*), the other

*日本語心理動詞がとる「に」名詞句と「を」名詞句の意味的特徴について (板東美智子)

**言語文化研究科博士後期課程

has so-called Theme marked by Accusative Case *-o* or Dative Case *-ni*. This note is to focus on the semantic character of the second argument marked by *-o* or *-ni*. One of the problems we will consider is the case in which some verbs allow alternation between the *-ni* phrase and the *-o* phrase, seen in (1):

- (1) a. Hanako-ga chichi-no seikou-ni yorokon-da
 Hanako-NOM father's success-DAT be pleased-PAST.
 'Hanako was pleased with her father's success'
- b. Hanako-ga chichi-no seikou-o yorokon-da
 Hanako-NOM father's success-ACC be pleased-PAST.
 'Hanako was pleased with her father's success'

Is this phenomenon a case of free alternation: i.e., are the two sentences semantically and syntactically the same? We intuitively find that the meaning of (1a) is different from (1b). *Chichi-no seikou-ni* in (1a) expresses *Hanako's* unexpected pleasure or *Hanako's* pleasure is from some other thing that her father's success will bring about. On the other hand, *Hanako* somehow expected her father's success in *chichi-no seikou-o* in (1b). As the central problem of this note, let us see where the intuition comes from.

1.1 Classification of Japanese Psych-verbs

There are three kinds of psych-verbs in simple sentences in Japanese with respect to the distribution of *-ni* and *-o*:

Group A: Verbs which only take *-ni*;

e.g., *odoroku* 'be surprised', *bikkurisuru* 'frighten', *kandousuru* 'be moved', *akogareru* 'adore', *kurushimu* 'suffer', *komaru* 'be troubled with', etc.

Group B: Verbs which take both *-o* and *-ni*;

e.g., *yorokobu* 'be pleased', *nageku* 'deplore', *tanoshimu* 'enjoy', *mayou* 'waver', *tamerau* 'hesitate', *nayamu* 'be worried', etc.

Group C: Verbs which only take *-o*;

e.g., *aisuru* 'love', *kirau* 'dislike', *sonkeisuru* 'respect', *shinziru* 'believe', *urayamu* 'envy', *awaremu* 'pity', etc.

We will look at the semantic properties of *-ni* NP and *-o* NP for each of the three groups.

2 Previous Observations about English and Japanese Psych-verbs

The second argument of psych-verbs has been the subject of much discussion in recent literature. There has been no explanation for the two implications illustrated with (1) in the Introduction. Let us review the research first, then see the problems this note will consider.

2.1 Pesetsky's Analysis Based on Semantic Roles

Fear in English is said to have its counterpart *frighten* as a lexical verb. To quote Belletti and Rizzi (1988:291), a fairly standard assumption is that in the general case, verbs expressing psychological states have a uniform θ -grid, involving an EXPERIENCER, the individual experiencing the mental state, and a THEME, the content or object of the mental state. This θ -grid can be projected onto a variety of syntactic configurations in an apparently arbitrary way¹. The sentences of (2) illustrate the assumption: the subject of (2a) has the Experiencer role and the object the Theme role, while the subject of (2b) has the Theme role and the object the Experiencer role:

- (2) a. Bill fears ghosts.
b. Ghosts frighten Bill. (Pesetsky (1995:18))

Pesetsky(1987:4-7), however, notes that the reading of (3a) is different from that of (3b), then considers what is generally termed the Theme role more closely with respect to the semantic implications:

- (3) a. Bill was very angry at the article in the *Times*

¹As the solution to the linking problem of the Theme-Experiencer sentence like (2b) that it refutes the Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH), they propose the unaccusative analysis for the sentence.

b. The article in the *Times* angered Bill greatly

Pesetsky notes that for (3a) to be true, Bill must have evaluated the article, and he must have formed a bad opinion of some aspect of it, thus the object *the article in the Times* bears the role Target of Emotion, rather than Theme: (3b) is appropriate even if Bill thinks the article is splendid. It can be true, for example, if Bill's favorite columnist has written, in Bill's opinion, a great article revealing examples of government corruption. The article does CAUSE Bill to be angry, and possibly angry at someone or something, but he is not necessarily angry at the article itself. Thus he calls the role of the subject *The article in the Times* Cause, instead of Theme.

Pesetsky(1995:58-59) notes that with this analysis of the semantic roles of *anger* and *angry*, these pairs are not true doublets at all and then the linking of particular arguments to grammatical relations is completely predictable. He assumes that the assignment for Experiencer predicates is made on the basis of the hierarchy in (4), where the highest argument is mapped onto the highest D-Structure position in its clause.

(4) Causer > Experiencer > Target of emotion

A verb like *anger*, with Causer and Experiencer arguments, will link Causer with some high position in its clause (e.g., subject of VP) and will link Experiencer with a lower position (e.g., direct object).

He also observed that throughout the examples he cited, Cause is always associated with the subject position, and Target of Emotion is associated with the object position of the simple sentences with psych-verbs.

2.2 Endo and Zushi's Analysis of the Case Alternation in Japanese

Endo and Zushi (1993:27-28) stated that Japanese has a paradigm similar to Pesetsky's. And the logical direct object in the paradigm seen in (5) can optionally alternate between Accusative *-o* and Dative *-ni* Case.

- (5) a. John-wa Mary kara-no present-ni yorokon-da
 John-TOP from Mary-GEN present-DAT be pleased-PAST
 'The present from Mary pleased John'
- b. John-wa Mary kara-no present-o yorokon-da
 John-TOP from Mary-GEN present-ACC be pleased-PAST
 'John was pleased with the present from Mary.'

To quote Endo and Zushi's interpretation, sentence (5a) can be appropriate even if John does not know what the present is; John can get pleased by just looking at a certain mailing package from Mary without knowing what is in it. Here *Mary kara-no present-ni* causes John to have a certain feeling, and thus can be 'Cause of emotion'. This is not the case with the sentence (5b). Here the sentence with the Accusative Case *-o* would be false if John did not know what the present was; he must evaluate the present itself. Thus the NP *Mary-kara-no present-o* may be called 'Target of emotion'.

The example (5a) does not go with Pesetsky's observation because the Experiencer *John* is found in a subject position rather than the Cause, *Mary-kara-no present*. They give an account of this discrepancy as this: the DAT-psych predicate like *yorokobu* in (5a) is unaccusative. The S-structure order of a DAT-psych sentence like (5a) is like (6a) below, which is derived by moving an Experiencer NP across a Cause NP.

On the other hand, the D-structure and S-structure configuration of (5b) would look like (6b), which is the same as its surface order (Endo and Zushi (1993:29)).

- (6) a. NP-NOM(Experiencer) NP-DAT(Cause) ____ Pred
- b. NP-NOM(Experiencer) NP-ACC(Target of emotion) Pred

We have taken a view that *-ni* NP of Japanese simple sentences with psych-verbs is assigned the Cause role and *-o* NP the Target role.

2.3 The Problem about the Semantic Role of *-Ni* NP

-Ni NP, however, has more diverse properties than the accusative NP: to begin with, it can be ambiguous between Cause and Target roles in one sentence:

- (7) Hanako-wa chichi-no seikou-ni yorokon-da
 Hanako-TOP father's success-DAT be pleased-PAST
 'Hanako was pleased with her father's success'

We read (7) in two ways: one of the readings is that *Hanako* was pleased just by getting the unexpected news of her father's success or pleased with something that her father's success would bring about. The other is that *Hanako* was pleased because her father's success which she had expected really happened and she formed a good feeling of some aspect of the event. Thus if we read the sentence (7) without any context, we can not tell which role *chichi-no seikou* ('father's success') has.

Furthermore there are some verbs which take only *-ni* NPs, but the NPs do not have Cause reading. The verb *kurushimu* 'have difficulty' is not subcategorized for Cause NP in the case of (8):

- (8) Kare-wa sono mondai-no rikai-ni/*-o kurushin-da
 He-TOP the problem-POS understanding-DAT/*-ACC have difficulty-PAST
 'He had difficulty in understanding the problem'

One way to see whether a simple sentence has Cause NP is to causativize the sentence, since causative is a Cause oriented structure which always has Cause in its subject position.

If the phrase *sono mondai-no rikai* was assigned Cause role it would be linked with the higher position than *kare* in the causative construction, according to the Pesetsky's hierarchy in (4). The sentence (8), however, can not be related to a causative construction seen in (9):

- (9)*Sono mondai-no rikai-ga kare-o kurushim-ase-ta
 the problem-POS understanding-NOM him-ACC have difficulty-CAUSE-PAS
 'Understanding the problem caused him to have difficulty'

We are led to suppose that the role of *sono mondai-no rikai* is not Cause.

3 Semantic Properties of *-ni* NP and *-o* NP

Having noted the problems of *-ni* NP in Section 2.3 we will go on to discuss the semantic properties of *-ni* and *-o* NP in detail along with the three groups classified in the Introduction.

3.1 Various Interpretations of *-ni* NP in Group A

Among the verbs in Group A which only take *-ni*, some are ambiguous as to the reading of *-ni* NP. They seem to be assigned either Cause or Target role:

- (10) Taro-wa sono denwa-ni odoroi-ta
 Taro-TOP the phone call-DAT be surprised-PAST
 'Taro was surprised at the phone call'

This sentence (10) can be understood as the following: (i) 'Taro was surprised at the sudden phone ring', which is Cause reading, and (ii) 'Taro was surprised at what he was told', which we read as Target. Then we will interpret (10) to be either (i) or (ii) in a certain context. We claim that the *-ni* NP in (10) has both roles basically.

When we add a modifier which suggests the unexpectedness of the event to the *-ni* NP, it works explicitly as Cause of the event which the sentence denotes:

- (11) Taro-wa totsuzen-no denwa-ni odoroi-ta
 Taro-TOP sudden the phone call-DAT be surprised-PAST
 'Taro was surprised at the sudden phone call'

The Cause NP *denwa* is also marked by *-de* and it is related to causative construction:

- (12) a. Taro-wa totsuzen-no denwa-de odoroi-ta
 Taro-TOP sudden the phone call-DAT be surprised-PAST
 'Taro was surprised at the sudden phone call'

- b. Totsuzen-no denwa-ga Taro-o odorok-ase-ta
 Sudden the phone call-NOM Taro-ACC be surprised-CAUSE-PAST
 'The sudden phone call surprised Taro'

There are, however, some examples in Group A which do not have the Cause reading. The NPs do not alternate between *-ni* and *-de* and can not be causativized, seen in (13), (14):

- (13) a. Hanako-wa aidoru-ni/*-de akogarere-ta
 Hanako-TOP idol-DAT adore-PAST
 'Hanako adored the idol'
- b. *Aidoru-ga Hanako-o akogare-sase-ta
 Idol-NOM Hanako-ACC adore-CAUSE-PAST
 'The idol caused Hanako to adore himself'
- (14) a. Taro-wa hentou-ni/*-de komat-ta
 Taro-TOP response-DAT be troubled-PAST
 'Taro was troubled with response'
- b. *Hentou-ga Taro-o komar-ase-ta
 Response-NOM Taro-ACC be troubled-CAUSE-PAST
 'Response caused Taro to be troubled with'

The *-ni* NP in (13a) is Target of *Hanako*'s adoring. In (14a) *Taro* expressed the matter he troubled with.

To summarize, there are two alternatives for the interpretation of *-ni* NP in Group A: *-ni* NP which is interpreted as Cause or as Target, and *-ni* NP which can be interpreted as Target only.

3.2 Various Interpretations of *-ni* NP in Group B

Verbs of Group B alternate between *-o* and *-ni* in their complement position. We have seen that some NPs with *-ni* bear both Cause and Target roles in Group A. The same variation can also be observed in Group B. *Tanoshimu* 'enjoy' will illustrate the difference:

- (15) a. Taro-wa sono ongaku-ni tanoshin-da
 Taro-TOP the music-DAT enjoy-PAST
 'Taro enjoyed the music'
- b. Taro-wa sono ongaku-o tanoshin-da
 Taro-TOP the music-ACC enjoy-PAST
 'Taro enjoyed the music'

We read the *-ni* NP of (15a) ambiguously: first it reads like *what Taro enjoyed* was *the music*, not other things. In this case Target reading is dominant over Cause reading. We also read that of (15a) like *Taro enjoyed the atmosphere because the music was good*. This is the Cause reading, since Target of his enjoyment was *the atmosphere* that *the music* created.

The *-o* NP of (15b) has only the Target reading: *Taro* must have a good feeling of some aspect of *the music*, then the Target of *Taro's* enjoyment is *the music*.

The difference between dative and accusative nouns is provided by Givón (1976:170) from a different point of view. Here we quote his explanation:

: ..., in Spanish the dative/accusative distinction may lexically differentiate the same verb as to the degree of involvement of the object NP, with the dative marking a higher degree of personal involvement:

- (16) a. lo (ACC) vi en la calle
 "I saw him in the street" (he was a patient, not a participant)
- b. le (DAT) vi en su oficina
 "I met him in his office" (he was a participant, not a patient)
- (17) a. la guerra le (DAT) sorprendió mucho
 "He was very surprised that the war happened" (he was cognitively affected)

- b. la guerra lo (ACC) sorprendió en París

“The war caught him by surprise in Paris” (he was a patient)

The same observation is found in the example (5), here again in (18):

- (18) a. John-wa Mary kara-no present-ni yorokon-da

- b. John-wa Mary kara-no present-o yorokon-da

When *Mary kara-no present-ni* has only Cause reading we interpret the sentence like *what John is pleased with* is some aspect of *Mary* that John associated with her present. This interpretation expresses that *the present* works only as Cause and the Target of his pleasure is some character of the person *Mary*. *Mary* is a kind of participant of the event in Givón’s term.

On the other hand the Target of being pleased with in (18b) is focused on the content of *her present* rather than *Mary*, since the sentence would be false if John did not know what the present was.

The degree of personal involvement of (18a) is higher than that of (18b), since (18a) implies *Mary’s* involvement in the event more than (18b) does. This leads us to suppose that the NP *Mary kara-no present-ni* can be paraphrased to a proposition which expresses the participation of *Mary* in the event: e.g., *Mary-ga present-o kure-ta node* ‘because *Mary* gave him the present’.

One of the factors that decide which role is dominant is in the character of nouns which goes with *-ni*. To see this observation, let us look at the examples in (19) and (20). *-Ni* NP alternates with *-de* in one construction, like (19), while it does not in another, like (20) which shows that the Target role of *-ni* NP is dominant over Cause:

- (19) a. Hanako-wa chichi-no seikou-ni(/-o) yorokon-da
 Hanako-TOP father’s success-DAT be pleased-PAST
 ‘Hanako was pleased with her father’s success’

- b. Hanako-wa chichi-no seikou-de yorokon-da
 Hanako-TOP father's success-INST be pleased-PAST
 'Hanako was pleased with her father's success'
- (20) a. Hanako-wa jibun-no koufuku-ni(/-o) yorokon-da
 Hanako-TOP self's happiness-DAT be pleased-PAST
 'Hanako was pleased with her own happiness'
- b. *Hanako-wa jibun-no koufuku-de yorokon-da
 Hanako-TOP self's happiness-INST be pleased-PAST
 'Hanako was pleased with her own happiness'

The examples of (19) and (20) provide some properties of the NPs. The NP which alternates with *-de* in (19) can be an event which *Hanako* did not expect to happen. The other NP which does not alternate with *-de* in (20) has to be evaluated by *Hanako*. It is not an unexpected event.

To summarize: *-ni* NP in Group B is also ambiguous in its interpretation: either Cause or Target, while *-o* NP which is alternated with *-ni* NP has the Target reading. We thus do not regard the alternation between *-ni* and *-o* in Group B as a free one. There is a possibility that *-ni* NP is derived from a proposition²). The character of the noun which goes with *-ni* takes part in deciding which role the NP has.

3.3 The Differences of *-o* NP in Group B and *-o* NP in Group C

We have mentioned that any NP which is assigned Accusative *-o* has the Target of emotion role. But there exists some difference among the Accusative *-o* NPs.

Verbs in Group C like *aisuru* 'love' allows generic nouns in its object position, while verbs of Group B like *yorokobu* 'be pleased' does not, as seen in (21). If the NP is individuated, the acceptability will increase, like (22):

²We propose that the syntactic status of the Cause *-ni* NP which is derived from a proposition should be an adjunct that adjoins to VP.

- (21) a. Taro-wa hon-o aishi-ta
 Taro-TOP books-ACC love-PAST
 'Taro loved books'
- b. *Taro-wa hon-o(/-ni) yorokon-da
 Taro-TOP books-ACC be pleased-PAST
 'Taro was pleased with books'
- (22) a. Taro-wa sono hon-o aishi-ta
 Taro-TOP the book-ACC love-PAST
 'Taro loved books'
- b. Taro-wa sono hon-o(/-ni) yorokon-da
 Taro-TOP the book-ACC be pleased-PAST
 'Taro was pleased with books'

(21a) implies that *Taro* loved reading: i.e., *hon* 'books' means his reading habit and it did not specify any certain book he read. We suppose that the reason *yorokobu* 'be pleased with' does not go with a generic nouns in (21) is that the character of the verb does not express a habitual state but an event.

The interpretation of *sono hon* 'the book' of (22a) is different from that of *sono hon* in (22b): in (22a) *Taro* loved the content of *the book* itself: the specific object *sono hon* is the Target of his affection, while in (22b) *Taro* was pleased with an event concerning *the book*, e.g., *Taro-wa sono hon-o morattakoto-o yorokon-da* 'Taro was pleased with the present of the book'.

We, therefore, claim that the *-ni/-o* NP which goes with an eventive verb like *yorokobu* must be derived from a proposition.

4 Conclusion

The observations in this note lead to the conclusion that the alternation of *-ni* and *-o* in a sentence is not a free one: the *-ni* NP and the *-o* NP have a different meaning from each other. Among the *-ni* NPs we have observed, some read ambiguously: either Cause or Target reading. We, therefore, hypothesize

that the *-ni* NPs bear both Cause and Target roles. Which role is dominant is dependent on the noun which *-ni* goes with, the modifier, or the context. Others read as Target. *-o* NP, on the other hand, holds the Target reading in general. The discussion regarding the difference between the Target reading of *-ni* NP and that of *-o* NP remains to be done. Lastly, we note a possibility that *-ni/-o* NP which an eventive verb takes is derived from a proposition.

References

- Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi (1988) "Psych-verbs and θ -theory," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik (1993) "Principles and Parameters Theory," *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Stemefeld, and V. Vennemann eds., Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- Endo, Yoshio and Mihoko Zushi (1993) "Stage/Individual-Level Psychological Predicates," *Argument Structure: Its Syntax and Acquisition*, Heizo Nakajima and Yukio Otsu eds., Kaitakusha.
- Givón, Talmy (1976) "Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement," in Li, C. ed., *Subject and Topic*, Academic Press, New York.
- Pesetsky, David (1987) "The Lexicon and Lexical Decomposition: Experienter Predicates," the text of a talk given at the International Congress of Linguists, E. Berlin.
- Pesetsky, David (1995) *Zero Syntax: Experiences and Cascades*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press.
- Teramura, Hideo (1984) *Nihongo no Syntax to Imi*, vol.2, Kuroshio shuppan.